

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/812,119	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LIPSCOMB ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> James M. Hewitt	<b>Art Unit</b> 3679	

**All Participants:**

(1) James M. Hewitt.

(2) John Lazarus.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 25 May 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1-3, 11, 14, 16-17, 20-21, 28-34

Prior art documents discussed:

Yokomatsu (EP 0 310 234) and Ramspott (DE 42 16 168)

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Applicant's representative and the Examiner agreed to amending the claims as reflected in the accompanying Examiner's Amendment in order to distinguish the claims over the prior art, particularly Yokomatsu (EP 0 310 234) and Ramspott (DE 42 16 168). Claims 16, 28 and 33 were agreed to be canceled to obviate a 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph rejection. Claims 20, 29 and 34 were agreed to be canceled to obviate a 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph rejection as well as a 35 USC 112 1st paragraph (new matter) rejection. The specification was agreed to be amended in order to correct certain informalities.